

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Molly Keel,)	Civil Action No.: 4:22-cv-02973-RBH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Waccamaw Mental Health in Conway SC;)	
Mrs. Johnson; Waccamaw Mental Health)	
in Columbia SC; and Mr. Fred Jones,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”)¹ of United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, who recommends summarily dismissing Plaintiff’s complaint. *See* ECF No. 13.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Plaintiff has not filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.² In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir.

¹ The Magistrate Judge issued the R & R in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e) (D.S.C.).

² Plaintiff’s objections were due by September 29, 2022. *See* ECF Nos 13 & 14.

1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

Having found no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's R & R [ECF No. 13] and **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's amended complaint *without prejudice and without issuance and service of process*.³

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
October 4, 2022

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
Chief United States District Judge

³ Plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time to seek an attorney and bring any paperwork into proper format on September 28, 2022. ECF No. 16. However, this motion does not object to the Magistrate Judge's finding that Plaintiff's complaint lacks sufficient factual allegations to state any plausible claims against Defendants. As such, Plaintiff's motion [ECF No. 16] is denied.